

## Message Text

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 01 STATE 044906

10  
ORIGIN IO-03

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 /004 R

66611  
DRAFTED BY: IO/TRC:SFRIEDLAND:MJF  
APPROVED BY: IO:MMCNAULL  
----- 089902  
R 272220Z FEB 75  
FM SECSTATE WASHDC  
TO AMEMBASSY LONDON

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE STATE 044906

FOLLOWING REPEAT THE HAGUE 684 ACTION SECSTATE INFO  
COPENHAGEN 11 FEBRUARY.

QUOTE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE THE HAGUE 0684

DEPT PLEASE PASS MARAD, FCC, OTP, COAST GUARD, NASA  
FROM O'NEILL

E.O. 11652: N/A  
TAGS: ETEL, TSPA  
SUBJECT: MARITIME SATELLITE TALKS IN DENMARK

1. DANES OPENED CONVERSATIONS BY EXPRESSING INTEREST IN  
HEARING NOT ONLY OUR VIEWS BUT THOSE THAT WE HAD ENCOUNTERED  
IN VISITING OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES, AND IN PARTICULAR  
SOVIET VIEWS. THEY WERE ALREADY AWARE OF US INTEREST IN  
TWO AGREEMENT FORMULA (HAVING BEEN INFORMED NOT ONLY BY  
AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN BUT IT APPEARED CLEAR THAT THEY HAD  
ALSO BEEN IN TOUCH WITH SCANDINAVIAN NEIGHBORS, PROBABLY  
THE NORWEGIANS IN PARTICULAR). US EXPLAINED US DESIGNATED  
ENTITY REQUIREMENT AND NEED FOR TWO AGREEMENTS, BUT DANES  
IMMEDIATELY COUNTERED THAT EASIER SOLUTION WOULD BE TO  
AMEND ARTICLE 6 OF POE CONVENTION, AND THAT US SHOULD SUG-  
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 STATE 044906

GEST TEXTUAL CHANGES (HERE THEY SOUNDED PARTICULARLY LIKE

NORWEGIANS). THEY EXPRESSED "ASTONISHMENT" AT US POSITION, STATING THAT POE MAJORITY HAD AGREED ON DRAFT CONVENTION. THEY ALSO REFERRED TO DIFFERENCE WITH INTELSAT ARRANGEMENT, AND SPECIFICALLY THAT IN INMARSAT THERE WAS A GOVERNMENT COMMITMENT ON SAFETY/DISTRESS.

2. US COUNTERED WITH REPETITION OF ARGUMENT ON US NEED FOR TWO AGREEMENTS, AND THEN ASKED WHAT DANES EXPECTED FROM LONDON CONFERENCE, POINTING OUT THAT US FELT REALISTIC EXPECTATION IS AGREEMENT ON INMARSAT ESTABLISHMENT AND SETTING UP OF WORKING PARTIES OR PREPARATORY COMMITTEES LOOKING TOWARD A SECOND CONFERENCE IN 12 TO 18 MONTHS. DANES REPLIED THAT THEY DOUBTED THAT 2 1/2 WEEKS AT LONDON WOULD BE SUFFICIENT TO ACCOMPLISH EVERYTHING, BUT HOPED THAT LONDON CONFERENCE WOULD AGREE ON INMARSAT ESTABLISHMENT, AND SET FORTH SPECIFICALLY WHAT THE SYSTEM'S RESPONSIBILITIES SHOULD ENTAIL SUCH AS PROVISION FOR SAFETY/DISTRESS.

3. US TEAM AGREED THAT INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT SHOULD INCLUDE SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES IN SAFETY-DISTRESS AREA WHICH IS CLEARLY OF GOD CONCERN. IN REGARD TO US DESIGNATED ENTITY US MADE CLEAR THAT USG COULD NOT GUARANTEE FINANCIAL COMMITMENT OF DESIGNATED ENTITY, BUT THAT THERE WOULD BE CLOSE COORDINATION BETWEEN ENTITY AND USG. US TEAM ALSO GAVE RUNDOWN ON GENERAL ATTITUDE OF US COMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS TOWARD INMARSAT.

4. DANES MADE CLEAR THEY THINK IT IMPORTANT THAT US BE A MEMBER OF INMARSAT AND THEY THEY ACCEPT THAT US DESIGNATED ENTITY WOULD BE A RESPONSIBLE ONE. DANES DID SAY THAT THEY EXPECTED RATES WOULD GO UP OVER COMING YEARS; THAT INTELSAT IS A PROFITABLE ORGANIZATION, AND THAT ONE MUST KEEP IN MIND THAT THE SHORT-TERM PROFIT POTENTIAL OF INMARSAT WAS OF AN ENTIRELY DIFFERENT NATURE. THIS LED TO DANES ASKING ABOUT SOVIET ATTITUDE TOWARD "COMMERCIAL BASES" IN US DRAFT OUTLINES. US TEAM GAVE SHORT RUNDOWN ON SOVIET VIEWS AS STATED IN MOSCOW TALKS.

5. DANES THEN ASKED THAT, IF IT IS INTENTION TO CONTINUE TWO-AGREEMENT ROAD, WHETHER US WOULD SUBMIT THE ACTUAL TEXT, LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 03 STATE 044906

PARTICULARLY OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT, TO OTHERS PRIOR TO LONDON. HERE AGAIN US WAS PRESSED WHETHER IT INTENDED TO REMAIN WITH TWO AGREEMENT RECOMMENDATION. TO WHICH US REPLIED THAT PURPOSE OF EUROPEAN TRIP WAS TO SEEK VIEWS OF OTHER GOVERNMENTS WHICH WE WOULD SERIOUSLY STUDY, BUT CERTAINLY OUR STRONG PRESENT FEELING IS THAT WE WILL STICK WITH TWO AGREEMENT APPROACH. DANES REPLIED THAT THEY WERE CONCERNED ABOUT DELAY THIS WOULD INTRODUCE TO CON-

REFERENCE AND THAT IT WAS US RESPONSIBILITY TO CONVINCE OTHERS THAT US APPROACH WOULD NOT RESULT IN UNDUE DELAY IN CONFERENCE ACHIEVEMENTS. THEY ALSO RECOMMENDED THAT INMARSAT AGREEMENT INCLUDE MORE SPECIFIC OBLIGATIONS ON PART OF GOVERNMENTS TO SUPERVISE ENTITIES THAN THOSE APPEARING IN INTELSAT.

6. REGARDING ACCESS DANES AGREED WITH NON-DISCRIMINATORY VIEW, AND SAID THAT IN GENERAL THEY FAVORED SIMILAR CHARGES FOR MEMBERS AND NON-MEMBERS, BUT FEEL THAT CHARGING DIFFERENTIAL IS NOT REALLY DISCRIMINATORY. ON PROCUREMENT POLICY THERE WAS SOME DIFFERENCE OF VIEW AMONG DANISH DELEGATION, BUT IN GENERAL DANES SYMPATHIZE WITH INTEREST OF OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES IN SOME NATIONAL DIVISION ON SUBCONTRACTS. ONE VIEW WAS THAT US ALTERNATIVE MIGHT BE MODIFIED BY LANGUAGE PROVIDING FOR SOME DIVISION OF SUBCONTRACTS PROVIDING IT DID NOT ADD TO COST. ON POSSIBLE USE OF MARISAT/MAROTS AS AN INTERIM ARRANGEMENT FOR INMARSAT DANES THOUGHT THIS WAS QUESTION FOR CONFERENCE TO DECIDE, BUT CAUTIONED AGAINST BINDING INMARSAT TO MRISAT TECHNICAL PARAMETERS THAT MIGHT HAMPER FUTURE DEVELOPMENT INMARSAT SYSTEM. ON INPUT OF SHIP OPERATOR VIEWS TO INMARSAT DANES FAVOR NATIONAL ADMINISTRATIONS REPRESENTING OWN OPERATORS. THERE WAS LENGTHY DISCUSSION OF HOW INTERNATIONAL SHIPPING COMMUNITIE VIEWS MIGHT BE RECOGNIZED, WITH DANES APPARENTLY ACCEPTING POSITION THAT ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK SHOULD INCLUDE MECHANISM WHEREBY INTERNATIONAL SHIPPING COMMUNITY FORMS ITS RECOMMENDATIONS OUTSIDE INMARSAT ORGANIZATIONS, AND THEN FORWARDS IT TO INMARSAT FOR CONSIDERATION. REGARDING SIZE OF SHIP TO BE INCLUDED IN SYSTEM DANES FAVOR SOMETHING LESS THAN 10,000 TONS, HOPING THAT IN LONG RUN INMARSAT MIGHT ACCOMMODATE VESSELS AS SMALL AS 500 TONS. FINALLY DANES FAVOR USE OF MARITIME SATELLITE SYSTEM BY SHIPS IN PORT.  
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 04 STATE 044906

7. ALL IN ALL DANES WERE PLEASANT BUT TOUGH, AND AS NOTED EARLIER THEY SEEM TO HAVE BEEN IN CLOSE TOUCH WITH NORWEGIANS. GOULD UNQUOTE KISSINGER

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** COMMUNICATION SATELLITES  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 27 FEB 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** MorefiRH  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975STATE044906  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** IO/TRC:SFRIEDLAND:MJF  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** N/A  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D750072-0611  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t1975026/aaaaaern.tel  
**Line Count:** 158  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ORIGIN IO  
**Original Classification:** LIMITED OFFICIAL USE  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** LIMITED OFFICIAL USE  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** MorefiRH  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 12 MAY 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <12 MAY 2003 by CunninFX>; APPROVED <19 MAY 2003 by MorefiRH>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
05 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MARITIME SATELLITE TALKS IN DENMARK  
**TAGS:** ETEL, TSPA, DA  
**To:** LONDON  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006